

## REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action of August 12, 2009. By way of this response, claims 1, 4, 16, 19, 31, and 33 have been amended. All claims are fully supported and no new matter has been entered. In view of the following remarks, the applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claims 1, 16, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Pham et al. (United States Patent No. 5,970,482) in view of Eftink (United States Patent No. 6,370,547).

#### Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites a method including determining an importance ranking of a plurality of variables associated with first and second datasets. Further, independent claim 1 recites generating a hierarchical matching grid including a plurality of levels based on the importance ranking of the plurality of variables, wherein each of the levels defines match criteria for satisfying a matching records condition by indicating which of the variables are to match.

As admitted in the Office action, Pham et al. does not teach or suggest generating a hierarchical matching grid. (*The Office action dated August 12, 2009*, page 3). To allegedly cure the admitted deficiencies of Pham et al., the Office action cites Eftink and asserts that Eftink “teaches generating a hierarchical matching grid including a plurality of levels based on the importance ranking of the plurality of variables.” (*Id.*). In support of this assertion,

the Office action refers to Eftink's description of confidence levels associated with an elimination of redundant data between two datasets.

The confidence levels of Eftink are assigned to comparisons of category identifiers (e.g., titles of two categories of data in two different datasets, such as 'Wellname no.1' in a first dataset and 'Wellname-1') and textual differences therebetween. However, in contrast to the hierarchical matching grid levels of claim 1, the confidence levels of Eftink in no way define match criteria indicating which of a plurality of variables are to match. In fact, the confidence levels are assigned to comparisons already executed; not used to determine which variables are to be compared.

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that neither Pham et al., Eftink, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

#### **Independent Claim 16**

Independent claim 16 recites a processor configured to determine an importance ranking of a plurality of variables associated with the first and second datasets. Further, independent claim 16 recites that the processor is configured to generate a hierarchical matching grid including a plurality of levels based on the importance ranking of the plurality of variables, wherein each of the levels defines match criteria for satisfying a matching records condition by indicating which of the variables are to match.

Neither Pham et al., Eftink, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests such a processor. Accordingly, independent claim 16 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

### **Independent Claim 31**

Independent claim 31 recites a machine readable medium having instructions stored thereon that, when executed, cause a machine to determine an importance ranking of a plurality of variables associated with first and second datasets. Further, independent claim 31 recites a machine readable medium having instructions stored thereon that, when executed, cause a machine to generate a hierarchical matching grid including a plurality of levels based on the importance ranking of the plurality of variables wherein each of the levels defines match criteria for satisfying a matching records condition by indicating which of the variables are to match.

Neither Pham et al., Eftink, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests such a machine readable medium. Accordingly, independent claim 31 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of this application and an early favorable action on the merits. If there are any remaining matters that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (*e.g.*, if such statements should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to refund any overpayment and charge any deficiency in the amount paid in connection with this paper or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

In addition, if a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is necessary to maintain the pendency of this case and is not otherwise requested in this case, the applicants request that the Commissioner consider this paper to be a petition for an appropriate extension of time and hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge the fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) corresponding to the needed extension of time to the above deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC  
150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2100  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 580-1020

**November 11, 2009**

/Daniel J. Glitto/

---

Daniel J. Glitto  
Registration No. 58,996  
Attorney for Applicant(s)